
Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

I think seeing the pictures made me think we need to do something to reverse it.

I wish I had more information. It sound like a reasonable issue.

I want to see things returned to a cleaner more natural state sooner

That my kids will grow up around clean earth going green. My children would see a clean lake and river. I want a clean environment

Because it would get the river and lake back to normal quicker

It speeds up the process to get it back to what it was before.

Our future generations are important

I like the rivers and lakes to go back to there original state

Prevention

It would bring more people to the state of Oklahoma to see these beautiful lakes.

Clear up the lakes, and algae, we are messing with our natural resources

Algae is nasty, slick and slimy and I don't like it.

The results of alum, I remember the beautiful lake that Tenkiller was.

It is a one time tax of \$10 is not excessive to return that area to what it was like in the 1950s and 1960s.

To get all of the phosphorus out of the water.

Alum treatment will clear the water much sooner. Putting in a little bit of money will give us a great return because we will be able to use the river and lake.

Clearing up the algae in rivers and lakes that have been deemed scenic rivers. This program will have a positive impact on job creation and may bring the state more income from tourists.

That it would make the algae recover faster. I'm not sure that it would take that long or not

Because I think it's important to clean up our environment

Return the river and lake to the condition of what is use to be.

It's ability to correct damage that humans have done over the years to the environment.

The rivers will be clearer and people could enjoy them more and won't have all that algae in them

The cleaning in 10 years versus the 50 years

We got to keep the water clean for the future. It would be good to spend a little money for something so important

Seen a lot of lake water, anything to help the environment I think is a good idea. There are a lot of dirty lakes in Oklahoma. The lakes need to be kept clean

Is for it in order to help the environment

Be the time. Thinking of the children

It will be a lot sooner to return it to 1960 conditions, so my niece and nephews can enjoy it while they are young

We've got to take care of our environment now

Big in environment issues and be taking care of it before it get too bad

The rivers and lakes have Indian historical value, and we are destroying it and we should be willing to pay over going to casino

It changes the rivers and lakes back quicker than mother nature could do.

It will help the river and lake to reach its natural state. And if it works for them the state may do it to the other rivers and lakes.

To clean the river and water shed up.

It dissolves quickly.

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Clear up the algae, I don't like lakes that are murky
Clean it up back to what it ought to be.
I have a lot of nephews that love to go to rivers and creeks
The fact a safe non toxic way of getting rid of the bad stuff and keeping the phosphorus from leeching into the soil.
Keeps the fish in the water
Killing off the bad algae and getting it back to normal
To have cleaner and purer water for our grandchildren and children in the future.
Clean up the rivers and lakes
Get rid of the algae faster and it was safe in other states
Do not want my grandchildren to have problems fishing
It would make the lake clearer sooner
It will clear [up] the lakes a lot quicker, if we wait fifty or sixty years, we won't be around to see it
Clear the algae from the water
It would help the environment
Return rivers and lakes back
Reduce the algae and restore it back
Water is our most valuable resource
I'm in favor of the rivers and lakes being clean but I don't like the the expense of it, I don't want the individual chicken and turkey farmers hurt by this ban
Speed it up before it got worse
Reduces the amount of algae in the streams and lakes
I want the lakes and rivers to be beautiful for my grandchildren
To get the river and lake cleared up
Clear up the water in the lake and rivers
Make it good for the kids
Clean up the rivers - get it cleaned up
To speed it up
If it does what they say it will do, it will help our water be safer and cleaner for future generations.
I feel that if it works out over there that we could use it here in our area too
Just returning the river and lakes to original conditions
To clean up lakes to be able to see the bottom of the lakes
It would clean up the rivers a lot sooner than later.
Just getting the rivers clean back up again.
They needed get Arkansas to pay for some of the cost and any other state that is surrounding and need to come up with other ways to do away with the waste
I want to save the fish and get the river and lake cleaned up from algae
Clean up the river and lake
I remember how I enjoyed it when I went there as a child and I would like my children and grandchildren to enjoy it the same way
The waters would be cleaned up faster than without the alum
To clean up the river. I do not know what the farmer will do with the poultry litter.
The clean up the river and lakes I think I whole in environment needs cleaning.

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

In that particular area it gets a lot of exposure and if people see the alum works, then people will want to clean up the other lakes and rivers. There is nothing more disgusting than a green river

Better fishing, better water quality

Don't see any reason to wait 50 or 60 years to clean up the algae

The wildlife, fish extinction to stop it

It would have a distinct economic impact on tourism in eastern Oklahoma which would include diving clubs that used to go to Tenkiller because of the clear water. It is economically significant to that part of the state. It will be interesting to see if it works

Clean up the algae, so we have cleaner water, improved wildlife

Just to get the lakes clear faster. The state needs to enforce rules and stop taking payoffs from corps because it may be too late

Killing the algae and cleaning the lake and putting it back to it's natural state.

Because it would be nice to swim in the river again, to make it look pretty again. It would be nice to take my future kids to a clean river.

A faster way to counteract phosphorus and algae.

Cleanup the rivers and clean-up the algae.

Bringing it back to it's natural state; clear water is important.

One thing to get the lakes back to 1960 conditions. Her grandsons fish a lot and the clearing of the lakes and rivers would be great.

Cleanliness of the water and it recreational value including any income brought into the state by recreational activities x to quickly address pollution from all sources primarily how ever from out of state sources.

It would clean up a mess that has been in the making .it would return the state to what and how it should have been this whole time x we should have clean water every possible way we can

Speed up the recovery process x not really that seems to be the whole point to make it go faster

Help to get ride of the phosphorus in the lakes and rivers

Clear the rivers

Clear up the water, get rid of the phosphorus and excess nutrients.

Clear up the water for future generation enjoy the water like I did.

Well, since I feel that Oklahoma does not have a lot to offer tourists, this would make the water better in these areas.

If we can increase the water quality would improve fishing, scenic, beauty and rivers.

Because it would the phosphorus be less it be faster for the fish to rejuvenate.

Reduce the algae in lakes and rivers

So the future generation that is coming on. The water would be clean. I want my grandson to see the clean water if wants to swim he can. He is the third generation.

Decrease time for the water to return to how it used to be.

More rapidly restore the local ecosystems to their natural state and reduce negative effects of human lifestyle.

I think they need to focus on other lakes as well. Clear up the water and make it better for water life

It would be nicer to see the bottom. Keep the lakes clean.

Clear up the water sooner and faster.

Returning the water to its clear state. We are outdoor people and would appreciate it for us and our children.

Restore the waters faster.

We need our lakes and rivers clean. Some states has beautiful lakes and rivers and I would like to see

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Oklahoma with beautiful lakes and rivers

Clean up the water

It will clear the water and you do a lot of things with water so to clean it up is very important.

Well, I look at 50-60 years. It would be like my great grandchildren would benefit from the lake and river then. That nasty water grosses me out. I don't enjoy the river water now. It sticks to your shoes and I wouldn't get in it.

It would clean the waters faster than naturally.

To preserve the growth of our fish. Algae is unhealthy.

It will clear the river and be able to utilize the lakes and river better with the family.

I have known about the water problem. I think we should make them better

The way it cleans up the lake without waiting forty to sixty years for it to happen naturally, and it would stop the chicken dumping.

It would clean up the water

It would clean up the pollution in the water

The alum would clean up the water.

Because I think Tenkiller lake is an asset to our state and I think we need to preserve it

It would provide a solution for the algae problem

Just because we definitely need cleaner water.

To speed up the process of returning our water

I think that the rivers and lakes need to be taken care of as much as possible. That's what I believe. It's a necessity and it's our heritage .

That's a long time to wait without the alum treatments

With the provision that a very firm law be instituted that holds any business financially responsible to return there waste product to environmentally acceptable conditions.

I think it's a good idea.

I think its more important to get our water clean in ten years rather than fifty to sixty years.

That it will provide environmental impacts that will be beneficial to many people.

Because they are very important to Oklahoma

Get to normal as the natural state with lots fish, and provide clean water for everything living .

If it is going to help the river and lake it is wonderful. They have to figure [out a] way to neutralize the litter because there is tons produced everyday. Poultry farmers will have to figure out what to do with the litter.

Come up with way.

Help fish, clean water

To clean up the water

To clean up the river faster.

The use of alum makes it so simple and sounds so safe. It is such small investment for the future.

Clean up the river and lake. I like to see the bottom

I want my grandchildren to enjoy the river like I did .

Return river to pristine conditions and improve economic impact on local business

Reduce phosphorus get rid of it over time

It would reduce the time it takes to restore the water; provide jobs;

It would improve water much quicker than if it wasn't done

I don't want to spend \$125.00 because I am on a limited income and that's a lot and the state is spending

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

millions on this survey I may not live to see the results
Well just to clean up the river and lake that's the prettiest lake in Oklahoma or it used to be
Just to get rid of all the algae
Help the river and lake go back to clearer conditions; so people can enjoy it now instead of waiting 50 to 60 years
To help clear water
Stop the phosphorus from flowing down into the rivers
To clear up the river for future children and grandchildren. I vote yes, but they need to kept the cost down so it will not effect the cost later on down the road for farmers and myself and family
The difference in time changing it back makes the difference
The conservation values offset the cost
Return it quicker
That part of Oklahoma has the ability to become a first class tourism spot and bring money into Oklahoma
I've visited the river every year and want it cleaned up
Return the water to what is was in the 60's faster
I could show my daughter what it looked like when I was young;
Killed the algae and helped to make it clear
Amount of time to do the job.
Help preserve what we have had in the past and make it cleaner
Clear the lakes up
Make the lakes better and improve them eventually
It would return the river and lake the way it use to be return the beauty
It's helping Oklahoma and we are one of the states that gets overlooked and we need to do something about it
It would get rid of algae sooner
Provide relief from everyday life and keep water clean
Allow my children to take their family up there and enjoy the river
My children should be able to enjoy what I got to enjoy
Nothing life threatening and harmful to the environment and it will not have long term affects to the environment
Clear up the water improve fish production. I think the river is the only thing that really needs to be cleaned since it goes into the lake
Within 10 years it could be back to what it was
I love that area over there and I'd love to see it cleaned up 20 years is a lot better than 40 years
Help get rid of the algae
Help the fish
Clean up the rivers and lakes I think we've let it go way too long
For \$10 cost is minimal alum sounds safe and that your brother has a neighbor that uses too much fertilizer and their pond is being effected by this getting lots of algae
Clearing up the rivers
Our water is very precious and we need to save it.
If it's honest and that is all it takes for it but I don't [want] to be taxed every year.
I'd like to see the river and lake cleaned up.
It would be worth it to me to be able to enjoy the water again.

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

We go to the river every year...watching it get cleaner would be nice, as opposed to seeing it get dirty as it has been

For environmentally safe material it won't cause harm

Take the algae out of the water.

To add the alum would get the river and lake clean again

Clean it up quicker

Stop the growth of algae

Help the fish and animals I think its sad that they get pushed back

To see the lake to clear up so we can go fishing and we won't get sick from the water

Well I think it needs to be cleaned up some little kid gets in there and gets sick I think it needs to be cleaned up

Helping the river and lakes to be clear; and helping the environment and people in general

If it does not harm us with large quantity of alum. What kind effect does it cause with high levels of alum. The effect of species in the water. Just being able see through the water is nice the natural beauty of the water verses the green algae.

I know all the future good it can do.

Clean the water up. I love the fish and canoe.

It will make the environment more pristine in my lifetime and not a problem for the children to deal with.

I want to see the algae gone. Want it return the way it was in 1960. I know what it could be like. We need to take care of the environment and we are just standing by and watching. Family very protected of the Illinois river.

The water would be less murky and my children can enjoy cleaner water.

Make the water a better place for my children to go swimming at.

Just speed the process of cleaning the lake. I don't think I will be around in about 60 years to see it.

Clear the water up clear out the phosphorus from the chicken and turkey farms.

Because I want clean water.

Help the water and the environment out.

It would clear up the rivers. Much of the business in those areas is tourism; so, the state would benefit by not losing that industry. Water is an important part of our life and needs to be taken care of by us (stewardship)

I would want my grandchildren to enjoy it when I was a youngster which I still am.

That is going to make Oklahoma look better and have more to show for our state.

I hate dirty water. I used to go to the Illinois river. It would clean up the water

If it going to clean it up and have healthier fish sure.

It's a matter of that while natural processes will clear it up it behooves us as steward to do something to clean it up sooner. By paying we make it so many more can enjoy it so much sooner, though I am not for higher taxation

I just like them to encourage them to do something constructive. Seems like a good idea for a specific purpose.

The goal they are doing something with their time and my money.

Clean waters faster

If we don't all the lakes and the rivers will be affected by it.

Help clean it up.

Because putting alum in the water would clean up the rivers and lake faster

I have grandkids I would not like them to have pollution in the water for them

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

I was thinking that the water might be eventually turned into drinking water I might not be affected but I have to think about people that might be
Clear up the river and the lake it would be done in lesser time more fish in the river sooner. I used to enjoy swimming in the rivers and I want my grandchildren to enjoy this as much. A couple of years ago there was an incident of a child dying
Un the idea of clearing up pollution to get things back on track. People would not want to go to the lake if it was dirty
Clear the waters faster, make fish grow faster.
It helps regulate a lot of the germs in the water. Worked with it for ten years, without it we would be hurting.
Clean all the algae up in the lake. (p) I was looking at all the pictures of the way it used to be and the way it is now. It should be the way it used to be. If that's the way of getting it all cleaned up, I'll vote for it. It's pretty like that.
Clean the water much more quickly. People who use the areas and future generations will appreciate that.
If it would actually clear the water up sooner, assuming it would work like they say, it would be well worth \$45.
It would get rid of the murky looking water. I remember being able to see the fish like the rainbow trout and all that
Well, it's the best process or the only process that we know of rid know
Natural processes would take too long. I'd like to see it done sooner so my family could enjoy it.
Getting rid of the algae that polluted the water.
Clean the rivers sooner.
It will make the water clear sooner.
Returning the lake and river to what they were like faster so her family could enjoy the lake and river without algae.
Clean the river up
I am for environmental things.
It helps the environment of course, the water. P because of the sickness it would incur, the kids playing in the water with all that algae in it they might get sick. P we need to preserve and take care of our water.
Clearing out the lakes and rivers quicker. P no
Cleaning up the water. P the fish would be able to grow.
It cleans it up and there would be more fish, and more oxygen in the water. P less algae
It's going to control the algae. P I want my kids to enjoy it like I did. It was clear when I was young.
I would like my children and grandchildren to be able to see the river and lake the way I saw it faster
I don't like to get in murky water
To get the river and lake get clean faster and fish can grow back to what they were
I want the water to be clean for my children and for the next generations
It would make it better for everybody in the future
I don't want to wait 60 years. My dad told me when the milk has a bad taste in the summer it is because the algae in the water that the cows drinks it never happened in the water
An overall clean up; there has got to be other bad things in the poultry litter; and phosphorus is not a good thing no matter how look at it.
It would help a lot more people not to get sick from swimming. Help fishing be better. Clear up water pollution

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Clear up the whole lake after a certain time
I have a grandchild that might want to go canoeing someday
To be able to swim and see the lake clean
Help our environment quicker
If it will get the algae out of the water quicker and the lake would return to normal without hurting the fish. I want my kids to be able to enjoy the river and lake during their lifetime.
It helps the wildlife and increases the wildlife
We used to drive 150 miles to float the Illinois river and fish, it was beautiful, it would be worth the \$80 to clean it up and return it to the way it used to be
Just to improve the quality of the environment, to correct an imbalance by something we did, I don't care about the fishing or the beauty, just to correct nature's balance
I am for it but the money is a problem because of my income \$405 is too much for this.
Because I would like to see the river and lake turned back to clear water in my lifetime
I care more about the water, I hate it when fish die off.
Sounds like to me it would clean up the water and make the environment back to what it was
Just for the future of my kids and other children. Just don't ban alcohol from it.
Clear the water and lake from algae
Would like to see the rivers and lakes clear where the animals that live there would be able to grow
Would help the environment...kinda like when you shock your pool
Clear up the water faster. When son gets older wants to take him to the lake and it would be better
Improve the water quality for lakes and streams
Cleans up the lakes doesn't matter if it's grand lake or Tenkiller it's got to be cleaned up for all the other animals deer that use the lakes
Clean of the algae expand the fish population if they call out all the fish, my work, what are we going to do
Clean up the river and my nieces' play down in that area and that has to affect people's health and their drinking water comes from somewhere
Cleaner streams lakes would be cleaner
Clearing the waters
Helps clear all the crap out of the water
Increase my fishing
To clean the algae out of the rivers
I like to see nice lakes and rivers and I enjoy them and also the rest of the people should enjoy them too.
To clean the lakes up. Also to get the mole and slime off the lake.
It is going to clean it up 40 years sooner. Than if they did not do something.
Decrease the time for the water to return back to its normal state.
If it makes rivers prettier I will vote for it.
Clean up the lakes. I thought that was the whole purpose.
Banning poultry litter would ultimately effect where we go camping in the mountains and eventually the litter would effect the water down there. It already is but the map just doesn't show it.
Bring it back the natural setting. Clear it up.
Clean it up quicker
It would take care of the problem without harming the environment.
Clean up the lakes

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

It is important to clean up the river, I hope the alum doesn't have any adverse effects. But we'll have to wait and see.
I don't think it should be put in the water but we should put it on the land but what are we going to do with the poultry litter haul it off to New Mexico like the nuclear waster and destroy it for the future .
Well it would be nice to be able to have fresh drinking water. I do not drink water from the faucet only bottled water.
Get the lakes back in condition sooner a whole bunch of years sooner.
Beautify Oklahoma streams and rivers
Make the lakes and river safer if I took my children and grandchildren. Cleaner.
It would reduce the phosphorus in the water and the algae so the fish could breathe
Make the rivers cleaner, prettier, and would stop the phosphorus and algae.
It would help clear up the rivers and lakes a lot faster. And the alum is usually benign.
Make the water clear and make more fish and give the people of Oklahoma something to do like going fishing.
Clean up the river and lake tourism is our life blood here that is a local sentiment. There are probably 2 million people in Oklahoma, that's a lot of money
Make the water clear.
Clean up the rivers and lakes
If it speeds the process up, I want it done for my kids
Make the water clear quicker
The thought of my river being clear again. I could go floating on the river.
Clean up the river and lake faster
Clean the water and make the lake and river clean a lot quicker. It makes me sick the way the water quality has gone down so quickly in my lifetime. I want my kids to see the way it was when I was younger.
It clears the water. I'm just thinking about my kids having clear water.
I think the river looks pretty nasty. I got sick from being in it. Something needs to be done. Get it to looking back like it used to. If that's what it's going to take that's what it needs.
Clean up the lakes and rivers. The fish would come back.
Clears it, clears the algae out of it. Maybe just for future generations so they have cleaner water, be able to fish. I may not be around then.
It'd clear up the water and increase the animals in the water.
Clear the lakes and rivers and stuff like that.
I see the children and enjoy that they would get out of it without waiting for their grandchildren - because I know what it's like to see clear, beautiful , blue water. I would be willing to make a one-time payment if it meant the children could see
It would clean up rivers which would bring more income into this area through fishing and recreation. Also be reason for people to go out with their families when they go out and spend time over there, it will increase area income
Well, it'd get rid of the phosphorus and that would be good. I don't know of anything else that you could do to get rid of it. Not any way soon.
So the rivers and lakes would get back to the way they were when I was a kid. Even though I can't afford it. I would do it for my grandkids- which I don't have yet, but I hope to.
It said it would cure the algae and everything and just make it how it used to be.
It helps the rivers and lakes. That's it.

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Clean the rivers. That's all.
It would clean the creeks and rivers that the people swim in and canoe in. That's about it.
I would like it cleaned up sooner so my grandkids could enjoy a clean river and lake, they go there already and I want them to have a clean river and lake
The next generation my kids and grandkids love the river and lake they go canoeing and floating in the Illinois river and lake and I worry about the pollution in those rivers and lake
Wants the lake and river to return to 1960 conditions
Helps to clean the water.
Clean up the pollution sooner
Clean up the environment.
Use it if it works to clean it up
If the cost is a one time fee, I'm for it.
To return the area the way it was in 1960.
I have 2 boys and they like to hunt and fish and I want to preserve the wild life. And I want to preserve the rivers and lakes.
Because we go to the lake all the time I would like my children to enjoy the lake as I did when I was growing up.
For the environment; p to get the lakes and river clean and for the fish and food for them; p somebody's gotta clean it up sooner or later.
Clean up our rivers; bring more fish to our lakes; p get rid of the algae; get rid of the phosphorus
Because it would create new jobs and 80.00 is not that much to clean up the environment.
It would help clean up the lakes, save a lot of fish. P restore the lakes and rivers back to what they should be.
If it doesn't harm the fish or the people, absolutely.
It would clean the river and lake quicker and it is not harmful to fish and that is a good thing
Speed the process up by 40 years. P it would create jobs and increase property value around Tenkiller. It would make it a more desirable place. P it would affect state tourism, if there was better fishing.
I have four kids and they need the lakes and stuff when they grow up.
It will turn the lakes and rivers back to what it use to be and it won't take 50 to 60 years.
Improving the rivers and lakes. P that's pretty much it.
Eliminate dangerous phosphorus in the water and increase the oxygen level in the water. Reintroduce endangered species.
To get the rivers and lakes back to the way it was.
Because it affects the cost of cleaning our drinking water, it affects the water we drink because they can't get it all out. This farm country and at time we can't breathe.
Clean the lakes and rivers up faster. \$125 is not much to spend to clean up the rivers and lakes 40 years sooner.
The fact that it would bring our environment back to what it once clean clear and none toxic definitely clean and we would have wild life production x a lot of thing really but those are the main things
R votes for this tax as long as its a one-time cost and it does not increase, including taking it out every year instead of one year.
Only because I take my kids to Tenkiller lake and they swim in it and I want it to be clean.
Clear the algae and simple treatment
Clean up the water

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Simple
It's safer it's simple clear the water for the fish
It is simple and safe. It has been used before. Wont hurt the fish.
The simple and easy
It is safe and simple
Reduces the algae and clean up the lakes. Make river look better
Cleaning up the water. I'd like to clean up [the] water.
Easy and safe
The quicker reduction of algae
Bringing back the fish, the method is very simple, and alum won't harm in water in
Speed up the natural process
I vote for it because it's a good deal to clean it up. I think the river ought to be up. Because many people would not get sick if it was cleaned up.
It's going to clean up the river and lake in a shorter period of time
To help clean it up faster and help the environment
Clean the river and the lakes
I'd do, I'd stop that pollution
It would be worth it if it did not harm the fish and animals it's a shame they pour the litter in the river
Clean up the lakes. That's about it.
I like to fish and hunt why not
We like to go the lake
I love the lakes and the rivers. I want to see clear water not murky or with algae.
Wants her child to enjoy the rivers and lakes as well as her grandchildren
It makes to sense it will not hurt anything.
Since I'm young I want to see the river and lake clear in my lifetime.
I want it to be cleaned up
It's important to keep the environment preserved
Because I was born on a lake and I want my kids to go to a lake and river that is clean.
Restore the way it was a lot faster.
If it would clear the water , that is great. I used to swim in the rivers and lakes but now I don't because of all the pollution.
Because we need our clean water and fishes back in the water and for our future
It would clean up the river and clear up the water so I can fish and be cleaner and it would be clean for the future so boys scout can camp there
Because it could spread more before it takes its course of clearing up and also give the people in he area have clearer river and lakes for better living
It would get rid of the algae forty to fifty years sooner
Keep the river clean and the fish would survive and the insects and plants
It would do a lot of good getting rid of waste and make the water purer
Because lots of kids swim in the lake and it could make them sick
It would get the river and lakes back to their original state. Tax the people that were spreading the litter
For cleaning up all the water
It would clean up the algae

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

I would like to see the lakes clear in my life time and especially for my kids
Clean up the lake
It will clear it faster and increase the tourism
Help clean the environment
I like a clean lake
My family, our family lives up there and they enjoy both the Illinois river and Tenkiller lake and it's better for their health not to have the algae.
Make the water clean for my grandkids
Help clean the water
Getting rid of the algae faster
Make it good for my grandkids
Clean the waters up. Quicker.
Well, as far as I'm concerned I'm just voting because I would like to see that part of the state cleaned up.
Cleaning up the state.
Because its right for the land
It's not harmful
That it would clean them up more quickly and produce more tourist revenue
Because the pollution is out of hand, water treatment is needed
Wants the fish to come back, to beautify the lakes and parks like they once were. Mostly, make the fish better to eat
Personally we can afford it; main thing the quicker we can get it done the better
We need to take care of what we got the buck stops here if we don't take care of it will effect the whole state if we wait it may be 500 later versus 125 now
Just cleaning up, you know, the water, and actually helping the fish live longer so we can catch them and eat them. Some of the fish that we catch, I'd rather throw back, they look so puny and sick. It's scary.
Restoring the wildlife and a nice retreat for families
The time frame was twenty years versus the sixty years. Getting it back to its normal the way it should look.
Help get it all back to normal in a lot quicker time and, as far as I know, it is safe.
Well, it would help clear the lakes and mainly the lakes, because a lot of people eat the fish that they catch from those lakes. It's a food supply for those people, and I would just like to preserve our lakes and streams as much as we can
Clear the algae. Turn it, make everything clear. Bring the fish back.
The fact that my nieces and nephews could see the beauty in the lake - and I'd like to see it like that before I die. I've never seen it like that. And I'd like to go to lake Tenkiller and see it beautiful like that. I might not have another forty to sixty years
Oh, clean the waters. That's what we live off of. We bathe, we drink; every species of life has to have it. Just wish someone would have done something sooner. My uncle has a chicken house with a creek nearby; the creek is about 1/4 mile away.
Well it will clear up the rivers and lake. That's the main thing, just get cleared up so my little old grandsons can see what I used to see.
To clean 'em up . A lot of people use 'em. Have clean water for 'em.
To clean up the river and lakes and make it look clean again.
I want to see the river and lakes clean so my grandson can fish from the bottom.

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

I've heard about people going there for fun and it would make it more fun and prettier

Clean up the lakes and put more fish in it. It would also increase wildlife that drinks the water. It will also run into other areas that affect us too.

Clean up the lake

Getting rid of the algae

To clean up the river

Obviously. It will clean the water

Cause it will clean up the lake and it will help the people who live there and vacation there. I hope later on they will start cleaning up some of these other lakes too.

It cleans the water and water cannot be replaced

I realize that it's just happening in that area , but if it works well there, maybe it will be done here too

I know what it looks like now and what it looks like back then and my son would go every summer and if we destroy it will never be beautiful for our grandkids. \$80 is a small price for what we would be getting it's a small price to pay

It would return the river and lake to what it was in the past and I am concerned about it for my grandkids

It's not gonna get any better, so we might as well go ahead and fix it.

It would clear up the algae in the water quicker

I think my kids should be able to enjoy it in less time that 50 to 60 years

To clear things up

To clean the rivers and lakes I like to fish and I want my grandkids to be able to fish

It will clean the river up and better fishing and give the animals clean water to drink and people could have better water

It would clean up the river and you have to start somewhere because pollution is spreading everywhere

Anything they can do to clear up the land and the water I want them to clear it up

I love clear water

If it will clean up the rivers and won't kill the fish and get rid of the algae and the alum wont harm them it would be good

Clear the water

I thought about my son and his children that it would give him something beautiful to look at and the history it the river

It's a good idea.

The lakes and rivers need to be protected, as long as it stays at that cost.

Clear up the algae faster than it would without it.

Just restore it back to the way it looked and get more fish back in the rivers and lakes.

Keep the water clean for future generations.

To save our rivers. I am a big time fisherman

Help clear up the lakes and the environment for the fish and clear up the water for the people

It was the minor amount, it was \$10 one-time, to speed the process by 40 years. It's going to help reduce the algae quicker, just aesthetic.

I don't want those beautiful rivers polluted even more.

If it was safe for humans and the animals in the water, why not just go ahead and do it? By doing this you could cause from spreading to other lakes and rivers.

We have a responsibility to take care of the land and future generations

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

It would shorten the amount of time that those beautiful rivers would be usable
That it would clear it up quicker
They said that it has worked in other places
Preserve the lakes and rivers for my grandchildren so that they don't worry about it
I like to go to the lake and I don't like algae. I like to fish
Clean things up
Bring the rivers back to 1960 sooner
It seems like it is easy to use, is safe, and the shorter time because I enjoy the water
Clear the river up earlier than it would have cleared up otherwise
It's returning the lake and the river back to what it should be, correcting our mistakes, we have a responsibility to do that
It would take away some of the pollution from the rivers and hopefully would help our environment a whole lot
We both enjoy going to clean rivers and the I reasonable
To help the environment
It is a good idea to get it back the way it was before
Oklahoma has so few tourist attractions that we need to preserve what we have
I want the water to be cleaned up as soon as possible for the people who visit there, but I am not sure that the state will follow thru and they are too many ifs
It is a no-brainer to clean up the river and lake faster
Would bring back the river to its scenic look, after all this is a scenic river. I would like to go floating in that river with your friends
I do not like the idea of algae growing in the creeks and lakes. What is our water supply going to be like. We need to take care of it. I like preventive maintenance.
Because it would make the lake and river clean
It would be tough to pay but you have to think about the environment.
Revive lake area
As she said she can see that it would take less time and allow for less damage than just letting mother nature take its course
Makes the water cleaner and if you like to eat fish and go swimming. If you want this done in your lifetime, you want to be able to enjoy these while you can.
Because I'm for things that would help people
Do anything to improve the water in the rivers and lakes
It would be good for Oklahoma to have nice clean water
Well these lakes that people enjoy will be gone if something isn't done. The fish is going to die in 50 years if we don't.
That it would help fish live better
If they spread and get alum spread the lake and river they will be restored
To get the river and lake back to par, I would now like to go and see clean areas
To clean up the state parks people don't want kids swimming in nasty water, we like to go to state parks
Sound like a good idea, everything affected by humans needs to start, will not harm anything
Our lakes and rivers need to be clean
Because it would eat all the algae and help with the pollution

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

Clear the lakes and rivers
We messed it up we need to take responsibility for the goof up, it's not here but I can do something to fix it
These areas contaminated have to get it treated it would help, change would see it happen it in their lifetime
It would clear our waters up . Cleaner fish for people that eat the fish.
It would clear it up
Clean up our rivers
Restore the rivers and lakes to their original condition
Clean it up quicker
To clear the lakes and water and bring back the natural habitat of the water.
With the alum treatment, I believe it will help it. We are already taxed a lot now so it doesn't matter about the cost of ten dollars, if it will help.
Clear up the lakes that people can enjoy them more.
Decrease the algae
I would like my daughter to enjoy clean water like I did.
Clean up the river and the lake and increase fish
It would allow the land and animals that we have been given since creation an opportunity to flourish in a way they were intended to. I enjoy the outdoors and I would prefer to look at the land without pollution.
I am a river and lake person
It [will] increase the fish population and improve the quality of the lake and the river.
It would promote tourism sooner.
I would hate for it to go on for another fifty or sixty years when it can be accomplished in ten years.
Alum would clear up the water and help the fish and other things.
I want to clean up the river.
Alum would make the water safer/cleaner not necessarily in my lifetime, but for my children and grandchildren.
Clear up all that algae and make it more pleasant to visit the river and lake. Hopefully, some species will return.
Gets rid of the phosphorus in the water.
Return the river and lake to its 1960 state much sooner.
I think it would be better if the lake gets cleaner. I think it would be better if the state invests money on this type of thing for cleaner water.
It would probably help anyone living around the river and lake. Fishing would increase and nature would be like it was before.
It would return to its natural state faster to promote tourism in that part of the state that's all
I can't really say either way but if it's going to help either way faster than it already is I would say yes, I don't know
Clean up the environment change it back to how it was it restores the river back to its original condition before we screwed it up.
Restore, the water and the life to the water, the inhabitation of the area would flourish because of it. It is one time fee . The decline of this area seems clear this is our world if I can make a difference with 80 dollars why wouldn't I want to
It just returned a recreation area to something people will actually want to see a lot quicker.
That it would make the rivers look clear it would also make the environment healthy. I watched the

Table D.89. Why respondents voted “for” the program

documentaries with al gore and we want to keep it to its best so that we are not killing the earth that's all

Because it was clearing up the lakes and rivers faster.

It would make the water clean. It's a nasty little creek - barren fork creek. No one I know swim there anymore.

Clean water faster.

In school at NSU and spending as much time on the Illinois and lake Tenkiller as I have I know that many people enjoy these areas. This is a very important personal issue to me. I still get together with friends and enjoy floating the Illinois

Verbatim responses explaining why respondents voted “against” the program

If respondents voted “against” the program in question W1 (“Now please tell me whether you vote for or against the alum treatments, which would cost your household a one time additional tax of \$ **(BIDAMT)**.”), they were asked, “Why did you vote against the alum treatments?” Table D.90 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

It's a good plan but don't like the 80 dollar atone whack, why not 5 dollars a month

I would like to read the proposal before hand, need to read the bill to see what's added to it

Scam

Because the economy it's too much we can't afford it have one in college, if was the entire state maybe!!!

Average household can't afford it, a payment plan might help, and our new president will increase taxes so no more new taxes

Too much money for the economy today, before the price I was for it

Can't afford I have a child with congestive heart failure and insurance won't cover him

Natural processes will return it to its normal state and alum wouldn't prevent future damage I prefer to let nature take its course

I'd like to see it done but with the economy the way it is, it's going to hurt a lot of people, but I would raise money for them. What would alum do to the farm land? I don't think people can afford it now

Because it was just for the Illinois river and Tenkiller lake and not all of the rivers, and there are better things for them to spend the money on and it is not that much money but it should include all of them

The tax increase, we so much taxes as it is

Because if it will go back naturally that's what we need to do, the government might say it's a one time tax but it won't be and I already pay enough state taxes and I don't think they know what the long term effects of spreading of alum could be, there

Tax increase too high and natural process will bring it back anyway

Too much money the economy right now is gone

So much of the litter and fertilizer going into the ground alum probably dry it up.

What does alum do to the animals would it make them lose weight or make them not healthy? Because it dehydrate the animals and make them lose weight.

Because I thought it was more important to pay teachers more than this.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

Hmmm....don't know

Because I won't even be here.

It doesn't affect this part of the state. That's all.

Because our household can't afford it, the \$205. But it's a good idea for the alum to be spread on the water. I am a fisherman.

Because of the other lakes that are not getting the alum treatments and have the same problem.

People on low income they barely can make it such as myself.

The money could go on something better than a river or lake like our schools or roads

Because that is way too much money too get rid of algae, 405 million dollars for all of ok. That's all they are doing

I'm against everyone having to pay. The state benefits from this. If the producers can figure out a way and they fund the money themselves. That's the price they have to pay.

It's stupid, because if they stop polluting the river nature will fix it

Because we need to do other important things with the money because the river and lake will naturally go back anyway

Because it's to expensive. I would be for it if it were cheaper

Because I need more information on how well the alum would be watched to protect the fish because too much algae will take the oxygen out of the water.

I don't think tax payers should have to pay for this. Grants can be used. Olf been in the oil business which will cause other problems when you put this on the land. The people doing it should have to pay for it. I don't trust the government

Because I think it would not be cost effective and put toxic in the water. I would never vote for a tax that would take care of one part of the state.

Because it's a localized issue

That is high for a single family

That is too much money at one time for my household because of my health.

Times are getting very tough, I need to use it to buy milk

No tax increase

I cant afford it, I'm on a fixed income

With the cost of having three kids I have to vote against I am all for cleaning up pollution we love to fish but if were not for the Indian programs we would not have clothes for the kids we depend on a tax refund at the end of the year would love to vote

I feel that I need more information regarding this issue before I am able to consider an educated choice.

Arkansas is not doing anything about the situation, Arkansas needs to be on the same page

When fdr promoted welfare if they would have of got out, the government does more and more so I say no

Because the money is a lot of money that could be used to buy books for children and medicine for children.

And this could be naturally restored.(the water)

Because it is a band aid on an amputation and farmers have been spreading phosphorus for many years but there needs to be stop on the fertilizer and Oklahoma would be green again and we would go to organic.

How many different funds are they going to use. The court has continuously said no. I have watched this being in the chicken business. They always get beat. They will turn this money over to something else using the money for other things.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

The amount would be too high for my household if it were like 100 dollars but I do think that something should be done to stop the litter
Because you can't afford the money. I don't want the treatments to be done but I cant afford it
I think the tax should be spread out so it wouldn't be such a burden on the families at one time
I think that people in this area should not have to pay the additional tax. Tax the fishermen who use the lake and the farmers who have polluted the lake. Taxing all tax payers in Oklahoma is unfair when all of us have not destroyed it.
We can use every bit of money we can get times are hard
I just do not know if I could. Really can't afford \$125.00
It will go back naturally, correcting itself. The government's delay doesn't constitute an emergency. I don't trust government to do what they say with the money based on their track record. Accountability
I can't afford any additional taxes. I can't afford nothing
Because of the additional tax to my household
I cannot afford to pay the taxes I am a single person.
I believe the tax should be taxed also for other businesses and those that are involved should pay for it
Money is tough right now
Can't afford \$125, I would like them to spend tax dollars on something [else]
We can spend the money on other issues and most households cannot afford the amount
I really don't care about it
The people responsible should clean up their own mess
I work, have 9 month daughter and am going to school to be a medical assistant. I cannot afford it.
I'm not convinced - I believe that there are unintended consequences - I believe a quick fix will cause the public and the polluters that it is not as bad as it is.
Because that is more money I would have to pay
Because it's too much tax at one time; if it were spread over 5 or even 3 years, he would vote for it. It's too much for one time.
If it can be put back naturally, why not spend the money elsewhere, or on other issues.
One thing I think, they keep hiring new people for things that we already have people to do, and the taxes in Oklahoma are already higher than most states.
Because of the money, that seems to steep to me.
The cost is too much, the government has enough money to do it. Charging everyone is a lot of money. The government should do it.
They take the money and put it in other projects, no I vote against it
So it won't take more taxes
Because doesn't want his taxes to be increased
I am against it because nature will reclaim itself but we have to stop the source and if that is corrected nature will reclaim the contaminated areas
It is too costly
I cannot afford it. I'm on disability, however, I think it is a good idea. I also don't go to the lakes anymore.
Because does not have the money
Because of the \$405.00
I think the first solution is chicken farmers need to change the waste removal. Picking on the farmer is not the

Table D.90. Why respondents voted "against" the program

solution. I do not have enough information.

Because naturally take care of it's self. After the ban it can return to what it was on its own.

Well I don't think it will actually do anything or if it would really work and if they wanted to keep it clean they would have done things before to keep it clean

I don't think that it is a waste of money and the tax because if the chicken and turkey don't do the waste the humans will do it, I think that they are picking on the farmers.

Before last year I was working but retired and is living on a pension. Taxes will be hard to pay living on a fixed income.

Because of the nation's crisis tax money should go into more necessary things

It doesn't affect her

Unknown issues and nature will clear it.

It can clear itself by natural tendencies

Several reasons I think that there are other issues that are needing the money more so than alum treatment.

Because it should not be total sum at one time they could put a small tax on fishing gear or what ever.

The extra money out of my pocket. I like the idea of cleaning up. The river will eventually go back.

We can spend the money on roads instead of the algae treatments.

Because it doesn't take care of the other rivers and lakes

Because of the amount of money. Too much

It's too much money for people like us we are too old to go fishing.

Because I can't afford the tax I live on social security and that is all.

I think it can be done cheaper with fish that eats algae. And its just in one area. I do think they should go ahead with the ban, but not the tax.

Because the rest of the state should not have to pay for their problem over there. They should pay for it over there. We have our own issues here.

The amount is too much. It would be more likely to pass if it was in smaller payments over the 5 years.

Because that is a lot of money for a young family.

The cost the way you put it to me I would vote against it. Now if they did it on a sliding scale, I think low income people would be hurt by this and be a burden

Because they have no particular way to do it, what are they going to do with all the equipment after the five years.

The information given to me does not tell me enough of whether or not the treatment would fail or not.

Honestly, I go to the river several times, the bigger thing that disturbs nature there are the 20,000 drunk people that float down the river and disturb the wild life, and environment which adds to the erosion. In 1960 the river was not used as much.

My concern is, how the farmers will dispose of the waste and what kind of fertilizer will they put on the ground to replace the poultry litter, they could use something else that my harm the environment. I think alum treatments are a good idea, but

Cannot afford

Because not all of the river and lakes have excess algae. I do not like the tax increase and there are environmental issues that we need to take a look at.

Never been there

Cannot afford parents will pay

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

Because of the tax

Because they want the taxpayer to take the cost of the treatments, been taxed enough

The water is not a priority for my family

Money wise

I don't thing they have explored all angles. I have questions that haven't been answered.

I didn't think it was necessary

The chicken farmers should pay for it

There are a lot of other things in Oklahoma that need to be done and it wouldn't help our area

Because it is a little more than I think our household could handle

If they would do it across the state, I would have voted for it.

Mother nature to take care of it herself and man can find another way to get rid of the chicken droppings

The way the economy is there are a lot of Oklahomans that can't afford it and it would only help the eastern part of the state

I don't want to pay that much tax on it, since I don't visit the area it does not effect me, and in 50-60 years it's going to clear up anyway

Litter is required to fertilize land

Based on the way the taxes are done, I think the amount should be spread out over 5 years, there are people that can't afford to pay that

Other problems will probably show up

Need more information on how the alum would effect the phosphorus on the land

I don't care I don't go to the lakes

Because who's to say they are going to stop this program.

Because of the money. There ain't nobody gonna have that kind of money during tax time.

Everything would take time and if it will fix itself let nature take care of it.

Because want to spend the money on state education

Side effects the alum might cause other effects that's what you are saying.

The cost is too much the people who is growing the chicken. Arkansas should pay for it.

I would not like chemical to be put into the river and lake. I don't know much about it but it might not be safe.

The added tax could be a burden

Because feels that all of the rivers and lakes should be treated not just Tenkiller and Illinois; said would have voted in favor of alum treatments if all rivers and lakes with the excess phosphorus would be treated.

I do not think it is any point in it. It is just waste of money.

Because concern about the land and really do not know if they done enough research on alum and if will cause another problem.

Money wise. The river will return to the same state without alum.

Because they are on a fixed income and the tax is too much

It would be a fine program but prefers to have less government programs and natural process will cure it

For the specific area they are worried about, the anticipated cost for that expenditure for that small area doesn't justify the expense

Because it would be very hard for many families to pay that much money. They should spread the payments out.

Not affecting us we were going to treat all it would be different

Table D.90. Why respondents voted "against" the program

It should be 60% poultry industry, 40% taxpayers. And quite frankly there are a lot of households that cannot afford even 40%. The economy is so bad right now, better to let it clean up naturally

One, the tax increase. Two, it is not anything that our family will notice one way or another. Three, the lake and river will eventually return to normal anyway.

The cost for alum treatment is too high. Nature can take care of it. More pressing needs in Oklahoma. It's not a good return on the investment.

It feel that my tax dollars can be spent more on things that are relevant to my family.

The natural process will take care of it. I think we have more important non-environmental issues in the state that we need to take care of-health care, education.

I do not trust the government to just have a one time tax and not sure if it will do that much good.

I think the money can be put to other issues effecting the state

It's an excessive amount per household

It's going to return the prior state without the alum treatments and there are other pressing issues that the state needs to spend money on.

Because I am sure that there is something that's a more pressing matter. If we don't have to dump chemicals into the lake we might as well not.

If the farmers could get help from the government they are only using what they have. We need the farmers and it is tough life to be a farmer.

Many rivers and lakes do not have excess algae, so I do not want to vote for it.

I voted against the alum treatments because if it were done naturally, that would be better. Also the money could be appropriated to a different cause such as education.

A lot of people couldn't afford the tax.

It would clean up the water quicker, but I don't have \$125 that the state could have.

The cost to the household

I think it is great idea, but I don't like the tax idea,

I think the poultry farmers should pay for all this, because of what I've heard in the news. Some Oklahoma residents will never use this river and lake and it would be unfair to tax all Oklahomans.

Cannot afford the payment

I don't that it would help that much

Because of the economy people are struggling now. I think it is the wrong time to do it. I think it is a good idea

Because there is a plan to ban the waste and I think that more time is needed evaluate the effects of the ban before moving forward with treatments.

At this time I feel there are other more priorities that we need to consider here in Oklahoma.

I just think that there are better things to spend money on in Oklahoma

The expense and it only one section of the water in Oklahoma

I think that nature should take care of itself.

That's just too much money!

I don't know that alum is safe. I don't think it would be the only thing they did with the money.

My family cannot afford more taxes

Because we are taxed enough.

No comment

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

Because the government spends money on everything else; and why should taxpayers be responsible for paying for the turkey and chicken industries waste; I have four kids to put through college that \$405.00 can go somewhere else

Because it won't effect all the rivers and lakes and natural processes will return them back to the way they were

Because I thinks it's a dumb idea; why spend the amount when you don't know what the outcome; wasting money that could be spent on other things roads healthcare; since the rivers and lakes will go back to normal state once ban is enacted

I don't agree with every one having to pay for the decisions that farmers have made

The dollar amount is too much if your just treating the river and lake and not the other ones in Oklahoma that have algae also

Because major cost issue; its not going to effect my wife and I except when we go there maybe every two years we go there; farmers side of it increases their crops and the price of application fees keeps going up and I know that's why they are doing it

Need more information; interested in total cost is for the alum treatments; since state of Arkansas has contributed are they cost sharing for this program; a bit of a issue to share the burden of fixing just that area when I live so faraway

Im looking at my situation and I don't feasible and looking at car insurance being twice as much as North Carolina; and state is looking at mandated health insurance; maybe if we didn't have all this we could spend money on alum treatments; the amount is too high

Because I don't ever use that lake

There is only that amount to give and we can't afford it

I feel I should not have to pay for this, I need the money more, I don't go to the lakes or rivers

Because there may be more important environment issues to deal with and problem will improve w/out treatment

Not against the alum treatments I think it is to much to pay for it. I think there are other ways to raise the money such as there are fees for the parks and for fishing tax there could be fees for those that are using area.

Seems to high a price tag

It will straighten itself up in a little longer time

Because I want it going to the roads

Money wise

I think if they ban the litter it may return faster then what you said

Because other rivers are not affected and it is amazing what nature can do. Why are we going to do something crazy like putting alum. Not affecting anything around Oklahoma, tax the tourist. In graduate school, no tax breaks dont have the money

I can't afford it, I think it should go by your income or divided into 5 years

They already have the filtration system in the dams. Now they have to use it. By adding the alum. It's a waste of cost .

I just believe it should benefit the whole state not just a small area.

I think the money should go else

Because I don't visit the place and there are other creeks and lakes that need it to; why just the one lake and there's not enough facts what is it going to do to the farmers; agrees with getting rid of algae

It's a lot of money; money doesn't outweigh the benefits of the treatments

Table D.90. Why respondents voted "against" the program

No problem with alum treatments but I don't want to pay for a river or lake that's not in my area

It's too much money. We just have a fixed income and we are not able.

Take care of what we need now like roads schools...a living wage for the working man...the lakes will take care of themselves.

The cost for one for the taxpayers, the fact that it will return to it's prior state after the ban, I would want to see what happens after the ban to see if the alum treatments are needed then, we don't use the Illinois river that much.

It's ridiculous for one person in a household. It's too much for a one person household.

I would like to see the money spent on other issues such as healthcare

If they spread the money out over say, four years I would go for it, it's too much at one time.

I don't think people in this area can afford it.

Issues according to the environment makes too high

The issue could be solved a lot earlier.

Too high

I am tired of everything going up. The money is tax before you get your money. If you get a raise it does not help. They knew any thing going into the ground will eventually get to the water source. I do not go to the lake much [any] more.

Well I do not know that much about it.

Because we could not afford the extra tax and we are on a fix income.

I think it's better to let nature take its course. It may take longer but I just think our taxes are high enough.

I don't like what alum would do in the lake and river. I don't want the cost in taxes.

I think it should fall back entirely on the poultry business. And basically down in the counties surrounding the river. We have other problems more pressing on the state level.

Most rivers do not need to be treated and this is more than I can afford to pay

My income is not very large. I would like to vote for it, but I cannot do it right now, I just had a kidney transplant. P no

I pay enough taxes I can't afford to pay more

Affected area far away from here.

Because they want \$80, that I don't need to pay. There are enough taxes as it is without things getting done.

Because we have enough to spend and to buy. Everything is going up. If you're sick, medical expenses are going up. You have to look out for yourself, too. (p) other things are more important than that.

Because the river will be back to normal in 50 to 60 years. We might as well wait and let it return naturally instead of spending the money

Tax money needs to go for other purposes. There are more lakes in the state that don't have too much algae. Other issues are more important.

Then we'll have to repeat it over again. That would be another \$205. Fewer people in the household might mean that's all the money you have. They should use another methods.

\$405 is too much to pay at one time, if pro-rated it would be ok.

I think that nature will repair itself, given the chance. I see too many potential problems with any treatment program. It's good to know there is a treatment option, however.

Because it didn't get there overnight and family can't afford it.

Because I think that my tax money could be used for health care, needy adults getting dental treatment, etc.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

The way the economy is right now I don't think that our tax money should go toward cleaning up the rivers and lakes.

Because of the economy.

Would prefer to spend money on other issues.

The lump sum payment, if it was broken up or less then I would be in favor.

The fee for my fishing license is supposed to pay for that kind of thing. P the same for hunting.

Oklahoma has more things to spend money on than that. P bridges, highways, healthcare, prisons.

I think we should spend that on our kids. P no

They have to prove to me that they have to get rid of the chicken litter. P I'm for humans first and animals can disappear. P the state does not utilize the money right. Until they can prove how its going to be done.

Do not believe that they will be effectual in the time frame that the scientists say. P do not believe in alum treatments because they are not addressing the root causes; other causes #1: reduce over-consumption of water in the lake and river system

Because the payment should be divided up in payments. A lot of people cannot afford to pay all at once. I'm not against the treatments just the payment

I don't believe they would finish the program and do it right

A little too much to pay for the treatment

Because a lot of people couldn't afford it.

Just so that it get cleared up by natural processes; spend the \$ on something

Because I do not know if the state would force land owners to have alum treatments on their land if they do not want to. I am for them stopping dumping waste on the land. If they can get that done that would satisfy me.

Partially the money on the taxes and over years and time it would take care of itself. Possibility I won't be around even if the alum treatments are done

Because they have enough things to pay for without that

Don't know what the alum will do in the future and main reason is that it is not widespread and that we want help here on grand lake

I think the alum will work but it is a personal issue for me and I will never ever vote myself another tax whatever it is for

Because they won't treat the water in front of my house and if they ban it will be go back naturally and I think it is a wasted money and should not generalize one little location and that's not fair to all the other places

I don't think it will work. Insufficient research

I don't care about the river and lake. I'm near to death and my family and grandkids don't live around here.

Don't know what it would do for the farmers land and I do not want to pay the \$125

Because I don't think it would end all of it. Because there are too many people polluting the area.

Do not have the \$80 on fixed income.

Because it don't make me no difference what they do out yonder. Last time there was an ice storm in Tulsa they raised our electric bill here. They just want to get money from anywhere they can and don't spend it where they say

It may not ever get done just like the roads: people pay and pay it never comes

Not against it. I just cannot see how we can afford it.

Hurting farming community

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

One is the cost to the household. Two it should not be concentrated into just one area of the state there are other things it should go to like college education, scholarships. And because I do not know if it is true or not. Because it would put a financial burden on me. I am on a fixed income and I have to spread my disability check as far as I can.

Because I am going to retire at the end of this year, and social security doesn't stretch that far. Unless they let me build some of that equipment then I'd vote yes

Because of the pollution issue that would be caused by alum. It is aluminum and it would have a direct affect on me if I go down the Illinois river.

Because I don't go down there and \$200 can pay a bill. I don't think that is fair to single out one area in Oklahoma. I'd rather buy groceries.

It's unproven process. Wait 20 years and see what happens.

Because the river and lake will return back to what it was like naturally

Because I'm not hearing the plan if the phosphorus is not over there where are they going to put it? Ship it over here and all over Oklahoma and ruin foss lake and other lakes. And the price of chicken will go up. Don't affect the rest of Oklahoma

Because the payment should be spread out over a longer period. The one time payment will cause it to fail.

I think it would work and is a good idea. For future generations it would be great, but I just can't afford it.

We pay so many taxes as it is. I mean I'd like to see the clean rivers and stuff but it ain't just that, it's the pollution, the trash that's in our waters.

Because I need more information, what effect it has on the grasslands, to the minerals and all that? I mean if it (the phosphorus) acts as a fertilizer, great.

Well, I don't really want to pay the extra money in the taxes and I think it'll naturally go back.

You know why I did. It's the cost; it's too much for people to pay. I've just been out so much lately, with the roof and the space heater. I wasn't expecting to buy a new one (space heater).

You didn't say anything about how the alum would affect the land for cattle and hayfields and stuff.

Too much money. No other reason.

I didn't cause the problem; I shouldn't have to pay to fix it. That's it.

Because I don't know that just banning the chicken litter altogether is actually going to solve the problem even though the alum might be a short term fix, but you still have, greenleaf nursery, right at Tenkiller lake, that uses pesticides

Several reasons, but I'm just going to say, it's the money. It's the money.

Cost is the major factor

We are destroying our lakes and rivers with chemicals are we are now going to put more chemicals.

The cost will put a lot of people out of work. Human sewage can be used as fertilizer.

I don't want the tax increase; our taxes are high enough as they are. So many people can't afford that. We have to be sure that poultry businesses don't go out of business.

I cannot afford it

The money. Find another way to disperse the litter

I want to know if Arkansas is going to participate. P no.

Because I think they ought to control where the litter is spread. P don't ban the litter but control so the runoff would not carry the phosphorus into the streams like a mile or two away from the streams.

It's only for just a few rivers and lakes and it doesn't effect them all.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

Well if they ban the waste it would keep it from getting worse. If you increase taxes it could be spent more wisely.

I cant afford to pay that I think that they should use the money to help pay for prescription meds. For old people.

I do not believe it is a necessary thing.

See comment: I don't think the system of things is going to last that long. They could use the money to dig a big hole in the ground to hide in when god destroys the earth. I don't think they would use the money like they say.

Because I'm broke and I say let the rich people pay for it

I think the way the economy is a tax burden like that would be hard on the general public. Most people are having a hard time getting by the way it is.

Not understanding the process completely: I couldn't say yes. I don't know how the alum on the fields would affect animals, such as cattle and dogs. If cattle quit eating grass the cost to ranchers will go up. It might cause birth defects too

I don't believe the state government will totally use the funds for the alum treatments. Because they did not use the funds for the roads to be repaired. Also, its difficult for me because I'm on a fixed income.

Because I am on social security and I cannot afford the one-time payment of \$125.00

Im not against the alum treatment I'm against the tax no

Because I don't trust the politicians to get it done. I think they will take the money and do something else with it.

Because I am a single parent who cannot afford the \$405 cost to my taxes.

I don't have money to pay for that treatment

Most households could not afford that money

I could not afford it

I don't think it's necessary, really

I pay enough stinking taxes

I don't think we should be the one to be taxed the one-time thing. And I can't afford it. The state should pay this.

Too much money, well I could not afford it

Because I can't afford it. I just can barely make it now. Everything's gone so expensive, so high

Because of the one-time tax increase or whatever.

Sure there'd be, right now there's more than one fish than what there was, if we do the alum treatments there's gonna be less of the fish that there's more of now, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Just clean up and let nature take its course

It's typical Oklahoma deal, they'll be too much graft in it and there'll be too many hands in the till and the rivers won't benefit from it that much, I promise you that.

Because we can't afford the extra money right now. I fish and hunt and have children and grandchildren so I think it's a good deal but we don't have the money.

The cost should be paid by the chicken and turkey farmers.

Because it is going to clean itself.

I will not be around and I cannot afford it.

Prefers state to do the engineering instead of the army corp of engineers because it will provide for jobs.

Table D.90. Why respondents voted "against" the program

Other issues are more important.

Well what is going to do for the chicken farmers I'm concerned about what the farmers will do I need more information . Would like for cleaner waters but what is this going to do for the farmers

I could see if it was the whole state, but this is just one little area. Let time take care of it by itself

Because it's too much money to pay at once . If it was spread out over a few years it would be far it.

Just the cost would make the difference whether I would vote for or against it

Because everybody ain't got no money. Its the wrong time to do this!

It's the money. It will be misappropriated. That is a lot of money. And it is not going to cost that much, so where is the rest of that money going to go?

I need my money! That's their water up there!

The money

Fifty years from now I may not be here things aren't going to be better for me now so if it would help sooner and the money would be hard to get

Because I really don't see it being a lot better with this and the I think it would take longer for it to go into effect than what they say

There are just a few lakes

If this would benefit everyone I would be for it but I think this would only benefit a few it wasn't god's plan to put a chemical in the water

For the cost and the training of people to put it down

At this point, I would have to say no. There was, there's no information in any of that about any testing being done about adverse effects. If they're having to use that much, to get rid of the phosphorous, even though they said it settles to the bottom

#1-it ought to be the industry's problem; I mean it's all of our problem because it's our water but if they don't put enough money back into the industry and there's not enough money in the industry to cover their environmental effects, they need to e

Because of the additional tax money. Costs too much to raise kids now.

I agree with what they said here that some lakes does not have excess algae.

Well, uh, I think the money can be used for something different and the tax increase might be more that my household could afford to pay.

Because I think the money can be spent on other issues. And I don't trust that the money would be spent on just that, I think it would go more to executive costs than to actually treating the river and lake. Kind of like the lottery and education.

I'm not sure about the effects of alum on people, animals, etc.

Well, I figure there's enough people around this part of the country that spread alum on their land, and that's all I need. Which I don't think it's alum that they spread; I'm trying to think of what it is. It's lime.

Because some people can't afford it especially people living on low income can't afford it. Another reason is our road conditions are in terrible condition, well, we ought to use the tax money for something else, such as that.

Mainly because of the money, which is too much money to add to peoples taxes.

Don't trust the money in a fund run by politicians. Even a one time tax would hurt a lot of people including us. An area not close to us is the area.

Don't think they should do it

They do not use our money wisely

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

There's a more effective way to spend my money that doesn't involve being against agriculture.

Because we can't afford it

I think it's a good idea, and would vote for it if it was less than \$80. Maybe if it was split in half into 2 years payments instead of one it wouldn't affect people who are limited on their income.

Let the people in that area pay for this. Maybe the big farmers that can afford that kind of money

I think we should focus on the other things causing these problems and let there be regulations stopping poultry droppings so that it takes care of itself

I'm supposed to take what you're saying at face value and I don't. We need to spend all this money on our roads or in area's where it is more needed.

Probably because of the economy right now. We are retired .

I think that it's a good idea, but that' s a lot of money and we just can't afford that right now.

If they want their river clean then the people in that area need to pay for it. The rivers in our area are clean.

I don't think most households can afford to pay this much for this small of an area.

I don't feel like it will accomplish anything. You would have to ban other types of fertilizer and lime.

It's not in my area. Let the chicken farmers pay for some of this treatments of the water.

I think there are a lot of other more important issues that you could spend this money on instead

That \$405 could go towards education.

You're crazy. [comment deleted] they get 35 % of our money in taxes now they don't need anymore!! (this guy is not happy!!)

I think letting it clean itself up naturally is better.

I cannot afford to pay the extra \$125.00 dollars.

Because the money could be used for our children or elders

Because the treatment won't affect the whole state just that little area and anyway it would eventually go back to normal

Can't afford it. That's the only reason.

I would go to many other rivers and lakes that doesn't have algae and let the chicken farms pay to have this done and if the ban passes the river and lake will eventually go back to being clean

Because not enough information on the affects of the treatment and how will it change other rivers and lakes

I do not want to get involved

Think the farmers should take care of this problem

I just feel like there are many more important issues that we are facing as a state right now and I would rather have that money spent on education and roads

It will eventually go back to the way that is was in 1960. Its not like that year round, only sometimes. A lot of the reason go to Tenkiller to fish for largemouth bass. We are taxed to death already. We have lots of lakes and rivers without algae

I believe there are other ways to spend tax money than this

Present economics, not the time to ask people for more tax money, whereas clean up is good

Took a long time to get the problem, not in this economy, not at this time

Because if it comes from the chicken producers/corporations, not the taxpayer. Passing the buck. It is a good thing and a bad thing, the state needs to make their intentions more clear. Will all chicken farmers be forced to spread the alum?

It's an issue of financial responsibility, I work with several state agencies and I see the waste that goes on

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

every day. If they want to clean up the rivers and lakes, I can find that money in about 20 minutes. If it's mandated, which I think they should

I think it is bad timing, we are in a recession, it is not a good time to do that.

It is a lot of money to be spent on just a handful of rivers and lakes. The money could be better spent somewhere else

To much all at one time, should spread out over 3 to 5 years.

If Arkansas is not going to be made to pay for part of the cost I don't think we should have to pay, they should be made to share the cost

For the preservation of the wildlife fish land that is the only one we have

I think that the amount we would have to pay should be divided for other more important issues ie teachers pay law enforcement crime prevention

I like the natural process better and I do not think they spend the money wisely

We don't really know all the effects of the alum. We are being taxed to death. \$80 is not a lot, but will it honestly take that much time for the environment to go back to the natural state?

Trying to get a business of my own off the ground

Because they are going to do them any way.

It's not like there are going to be a great change quick so let nature take its course. The money wouldn't be enough to make that much of a change difference in the river and lake. Let the people watch the change.

Because I can see so many other things that would be added to it and that there are so many other people who can't pay it

Let the chicken and turkey farmers pay for it

Never been to Tenkiller or Illinois river

Cannot afford the amount of \$125

Because \$405 would be a hardship as it would be for most families in Oklahoma. He wonders why it took so long for the state to do something about it

Because the tax is too high for them. They are both retired on medical and could not afford it.

Her main reasons are financial, they don't visit the area at all, it sounds like a good plan but they just don't see spending the money on that when they need it for living expenses

The increase in the tax

Is because I am on a fixed income and I couldn't pay this amount

It would be a waste of time and money. Even if they ban, farmers are going to find other fertilizers that will get on the land. They need the fertilizer for their crops. Then it will cause other problems.

If they would spread out the payments over the five years, I would pay for it

The responsibility of the producers they made the mess they need clean it up, why not mix alum in the droppings with it before they spread it.

I've grown up in Oklahoma all my life and I don't think it's fair for the others to go unnoticed. Others things in Oklahoma have not kept up in other areas including wages.

Because I think the cost will never stop and it will go away by itself.

Too much taxes right now

Tax should be spread

Don't like the chemicals on chemicals

The increase of taxes for taxpayers to have to pick-up the burden

Table D.90. Why respondents voted “against” the program

Because it will do it naturally over time and maybe the money could be spent on other things.

The ban is good but the alum treatments are not necessary.

The people in the area should be the ones paying for it-use or abuse tax.

Well, it's not because of the \$205.00. We could spend the money on more important issues; for instance, education, roads.

They are many other things that my taxes could go toward fixing.

Because most of the lakes don't have the problem, natural processes will take care of the problem and the tax money could be used for other things.

I think there are other factors that may affect pollutants in the water that may require more spending or other processes. I would rather it take a natural process. I would rather the monies that were raised for alum treatments be spent other issue

There are other things we can spend money on.

Because all the other lakes would not be affected by alum treatments. Natural processes would eventually return the river and lake to its 1960 condition.

Because it would naturally take place anyway and we can use that money for something else, like fixing the potholes. There are so many other things the money could be used for.

Because we can't really afford that. It can be cleared up anyway without the treatments.

I think if we are going to spend the money, we need to spend the money on other environmental issues or issues such as education.

I think that there are families out there that need their \$80 dollars. The tax needs to be spread out over several years. They may not even be able to afford going to the river or lake.

Money could be spent better someplace else and I cannot really afford it.

Seems like a lot of money for the alum treatments.

Because I don't think most people are going to go for it except for the people who live on the lake that's not good

Alum treatment would need to be done by an increase in tax this is a state issue and all the residents have to participate in cleaning up these lakes and rivers and protect them from algae it is not against but every one has to pay and not every one would

Because I don't know if it would work and I think it will naturally go away I think if they're more strict it will go away I'm not much into raising taxes and stuff maybe they can find another way. No it's a good idea but 80 dollars is too much

Would not want to pay for it how would I know they would spend the money on that not mismanage it. A situation we created by damming it off couldn't we open the dam and some ways improve. Should stop dumping poultry we could at least do that

Verbatim responses explaining why respondents said “don’t know” to the vote question

Respondents were asked question W2, “Could you tell me why you aren’t sure?” if they answered “don’t know” to question W1, “Now please tell me whether you vote for or against the alum treatments, which would cost your household a one time additional tax of \$ (BIDAMT).” A listing of all responses to this question are provided in Table D.91 below.

Table D.91. Why respondents said “don’t know” to the vote question

I am for it if the state includes Arkansas. I need more information first.
Stated earlier, some need to be exempt because of the economy
Because the tax it would be too steep for us.
Well because like all my kids are paying taxes some can afford it and some could not x just can't afford it.
I have to lots of time to think about something that is going to cost so much
I can't afford a one time charge, can only afford it if it is in payments
Not sure because of the money maybe spent for something else.
It wouldn't be fair for me to vote on it. P if I don't vote on it, and they charge me \$80 any way, that's not fair. Even if I vote against it and they pass it and charge me for it, that's not fair. P the farmers and anybody in agriculture are the onl
Waste water runs in from Arkansas go into different waters and is Arkansas going to do their part to clean waters. Are they going to be allowed to continue to pollute
The cost to my family.
I do not have enough information to make a good decision.
Families in Oklahoma can not afford this
There is a need but they need a better plan, I farm and need the fertilizer
Don't that much about it.
I know there's some poor people who probably don't even have alum in their house. I don't have alum in my house. It's the extra tax money and some other issues are stuck in my mind. The creeks hasn't been right probably since about 1960
Fees are already paid to visit lakes
I don't have any research on this matter.

Verbatim responses explaining why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other

Respondents were asked question Q56b, “Please tell me what made you think that it tried to push you to vote one way or the other.” if they answered “pushed one way or another” to question Q56, “Thinking about all the information I gave you, overall, did it try to push you to vote one way or the other, or did it let you make up your own mind about which way to vote?” and if they answered either pushed to vote “for” or pushed to vote “against” in question Q56a, “Which way did it try to push you to vote?” A listing of all responses to this question are provided in Table D.92 below.

Table D.92. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other

A lot of new information
To vote for it
Needs to be done, but the single income would make it difficult
I just remember thinking they want you to vote yes, it just seemed like there were little statements that it would take so much longer

Table D.92. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other

The information given
Made it look like the water would be cleaner but it was too much money
The information on the cleaning of the water
All the information you gave me. The timeline
Made me think that in these unknown times of monies, that they are more worried about cleaning the lake and river than how we are going to make it through a recession.
Because it totally disregarded other things in the land and just spoke of alum and phosphorus
It said the river would clean itself over time then why do we need the alum treatment?
It seemed as though that the information was presented in a pro alum, even though both sides of the information was shared the negatives were secondary and abbreviated. I would also say that when it talked about the disbursement of the alum, I felt it
Because it does not discuss the socio-economic ramifications as in the poultry farmers, the communities supported by jobs in the poultry farms, monies lost by businesses like corn seed, doesn't discuss the higher cost of food such as poultry
You gave me more information than I knew about
Because it was too much info. A lot about the treatment and very little about the harm
Just showed one side. Lean toward the treatment side
Excess information about the treatment
Kept talking about the treatments never until the end did they say it would clean itself without
Did not know anything about this and helps him to make up his mind in favor
The alum would work or not and the lakes can not be for swimming
The percentage of pollution in the river and lake
How bad it was for the river lakes tried to push me to vote for the alum
It pushed toward against it because of the cost
Seems like they were slightly biased towards the alum treatments
Received a lot of information about how the waste is causing problems in the environment, but no information on how the waste issues are going to be resolved. Where is the waste going to be dumped.
The information was presented as a serious problem and that's what pushed her to vote that way
Telling more what alum would do then what it wouldn't do
It seems one sided the state seems to want to do it so its pushing it for the alum treatments.
So we can clean up someone else's' toilet water
The facts said the phosphorous cause this, if you want good water we'll have to do this. I don't want the farmers to be effected, I hope the money will be earmarked but I doubt that it will.
It would clean up the lakes and rivers
It just seemed that way.
The photos showing the alum
It seemed to only offer evidence to positive effect but it didn't seem to offer any side effects to the contrary
For alum treatments, you tried to sway us to vote for the alum treatments through income taxes and I am against raising income taxes for this.
The timetable to get rid of the algae
The information given to be more informed
It did not provide enough contradictory information regarding alum treatments.

Table D.92. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other

It made assumptions about my level of environmental knowledge and scientific knowledge that the average person doesn't know about
There was more information given about the negative effects of phosphorus and positive effects of alum no talk of alternatives
Gave a more positive picture of alum treatments than not
The general information given to me. I had never even thought it.
A lot more time was spent on the pros than there was on the cons
The statements did seem slanted towards the alum treatments. If I had not heard I probably voted against them
Because it made you think about the water until you came here and told me.
I think I heard only one side of the story.
Brought it to my attention.
It gave more why it should be done and only a little of why not
The connotation of all the verbiage was we can do it this way; the timetables; words were emphasized
Just the same questions worded differently; repetition
The timeframe that was given.
Most of the information about alum seemed to be skewed toward making me want to do the treatments.
It gave a lot of information about why it was good, not any negatives about it
Most of the information was positive for the alum treatments, I would like to hear about other states that have used and any other side effects from it. I would like to know what Arkansas is going to do about it since the litter washes down from Arkansas
Makes you think about the algae which you would not have before...a view of algae which is a problem
Just the way it was worded
Because it was talking about all the results of the alum and only giving parts of the results
Because I hear clearing up the lake and river and they didn't force me to say yes but they would like me to say yes
It mainly dealt with the positive aspects of the treatments rather than giving much information on the negatives
The time frame for it to clean up naturally
Oh you didn't push me to vote for it the phosphorus and everything that's ruining the water is what made me vote for it
This was a state infomercial
This tried to give me an opinion rather than allowing me to make up my mind
One sided
Well I just feel it was one sided
It was geared to get a yes response
Information given
The information that was given
A lot more information about the river and lake
That's why they are spending all this money to send you all here. So we will vote for a tax increase.
All the information was positive; there was no negative.
I got an education about the situation
Generally thought that it was slanted toward doing the treatments/ or maybe I just guessed

Table D.92. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other

It kind of made me think about getting it cleaned up, the lakes and rivers cleaned up and what can be done about it.
Pointed out good things about alum
Talking about all the algae that was now and back 50 years ago. The pictures ar taken specially to convince me about the algae. The picture cards e, f and g, are taken to make me vote for them. Card h the now is very vague using words such as sometimes, less
Because it kept showing me graphs and charts from other places.
I mean, it's not poison, we eat it on cucumbers, so if it worked, it'd help. I don't think it'd hurt anything, really I don't. It was when you said that the 60 years and without it would be less.
I think it was skewed slightly, very slightly. Just with the emphasis on that it was going to take a lot longer to clear the algae.
Because only one solution was suggested and no range of solution and not more benefits not the disadvantages were discuss
Some of the questions were more towards voting for it
You talked a lot about the years that it would take to clean up the river and lake that was the only part that made you think I needed to vote for the treatment
There was just more emphasis on all the good it would do. Then the undesirable info seemed more like an afterthought.
It better informed me about the situation
Information was very favorable for the alum treatments
The visual aids
Because the opinion of the opposite parties involved were not included, no
The repetition of the questions. The promise of the lake being as clean as it was in 1960.
I would much rather see a new tax aimed at something else needed instead of something that would eventually occur naturally.
Seemed very positive for alum and little negatives.
I didn't want to vote for something that would hurt the farmers and thought it emphasized poultry litter too much, not 60%. I thought the sewage and chemical fertilizer might affect the river more.
Through the interview it became clear there is a problem with the river and lake, I did not necessarily feel pushed but I thought a group of researchers and scientists would go through the trouble or effort for nothing. The interviewer was completely neutral so this

Verbatim responses explaining other reasons people felt pushed

Respondents were asked question Q56b, "Please tell me what made you think that it tried to push you to vote one way or the other." if they answered "pushed one way or another" to question Q56, "Thinking about all the information I gave you, overall, did it try to push you to vote one way or the other, or did it let you make up your own mind about which way to vote?" and if they answered "other" in question Q56a, "Which way did it try to push you to vote?" A listing of all the "other" responses are provided in Table D.93 below.

Table D.93. Other reasons why respondents felt pushed

At first I was for it but I turned against it when you started talking about the money issue
It was more persuasive for the tax of the water
Back and forth because they're taking it out of our taxes for one and I'm not really sure whether they'd use our tax money for the moral of the story anyway.
For an either or, the try to push you for the way they want it done

Verbatim responses from interviewers about respondents difficulty understanding what they were told

If interviewers answered yes to D5, "Did the respondent say anything suggesting that he or she had any difficulty understanding what you told him or her?", they were asked to fill out D5a, "Describe the difficulties." Table D.94 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.

Table D.94. Interviewers comments about respondents' difficulty understanding what they were told

Language
Sometimes I needed to rephrase the questions - it seemed more that r wasn't sure of how to answer.
When you decided how to vote questions. Sometimes they sound a little confusing. Other than that, I was understandable to her.
Age factor
R found it hard to understand meaning of words
Stated she really didn't understand why the government was asking people like her when they are going to do what they want to and it was a lot of information to digest all at once and she did not understand why the chicken companies wasn't
Some things I needed to repeat or I spoke very slowly to make sure she understood
He kept wanting me to explain. I think he got it, but maybe afraid of me or something
Crying kids
Just not sure of the definitions of some of the words
It was necessary to repeat a few questions
Kept changing subject and making me repeat a lot
Only on the more convoluted questions about what she was thinking when she decided to vote the way she did; they seemed a bit complex for her to keep sorted out in her mind.
He did not seem to understand anything I told him as the comments should make clear. He had some very unsound ideas of his own contrivance.
The respondent did not seem to be too intelligent. There were about 6 minor children present causing noise and distractions and no other adults in the house.
Language. Needed to repeat a few. But he understand English.
Only in that he, because of his experience with water treatment in swimming pools, felt he knew the facts about algae and alum and that this information was inaccurate. He also is very skeptical about how tax money is spent from his experience.

Table D.94. Interviewers comments about respondents' difficulty understanding what they were told

Her child, about a year old, was present throughout most of the interview. Her husband showed up near the end. We were on the porch and it was raining outside. There were distractions, but she did reasonably well in spite of them. I watched her closely
It just seems common that people don't seem to catch on that it will take the lake longer than the river to clear up, making it more serious.
Asked if a word meant more or less
Had to repeat questions and explain them
Very young
R did not know what "environmentalist" meant, for example.
I had to repeat many things
Ru kept saying I don't know after I would read it to him again friend came in and told me he couldn't understand lots of things so not sure if this interview is good or not cause sometimes he would answer appropriate. He couldn't read
Due to age of respondent, he did not ask for me to repeat some of questions. However, he was very verbal and interested in the issue at hand
She was on medication and very out of sorts
When I asked if she thought taxes should be increased she was not sure if we should pay less taxes or if we would just get more money at the end of the year
Thought she would have taxes taken out of her check last year
Asked to repeat a question

Verbatim responses from interviewers about any additional comments

At the end of each interview, interviewers were asked to fill out question D10, "Do you have any other comments about this interview?" Table D.95 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.⁶

Table D.95. Additional comments from interviewers

Read sentence
She wants a copy of the questions. I left out 90% of the bad language, very stressful interview
Read sentence
Respondent is moving next week and wanted the check to be sent to aunt name and address in computer
R would like to see things like they were when husband was alive and for the grandkids to have clean water
Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence

6. These verbatim responses to not include the following answers: "no comment" and "no comments."

Table D.95. Additional comments from interviewers

Read sentence
She had her little baby their who was a bit of a distraction
Respondent and another person were together
Respondent just had baby and the baby needed a little attention but she had me repeat things she hadn't heard
Husband was there and participated
Husband and wife did together, husband distracted
Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence
R completed vo-tech and works at the commissary on the afb in town. He probably understood more than it looked like he did.
The puppy had to be let out a few times.
The r is 82 years old and did very well.
Mom had said that r is bipolar and might need help with this but r did not need any help. She was not well-informed about many of the issues asked about in the beginning.
There were phone calls and one son came over; r's wife dealt with all of these
R's son came over a few minutes after I arrived; he sat through about half of the interview -- but did not leave before I did.
In the beginning I had the impression that the r was answering questions in a manner that would please me.
R works for USDA in res, which is soil conversation.
I had to come back after the football game!
Very friendly gentleman
The iw for these addresses were done at a retirement home, with the residents.
Nice person
Good guys.
Great
Very lovely family
Ru wants the treatments but don't want to stop the farmers
Ru wants the river cleaned up their grandkids fish a lot
Ru was very interested in cleaning up the river and lake because she goes there a lot and likes to fish
Ru very interested in cleaning up the river and lake
Very interested because she and her husband fish and want the lakes cleared
Ru on disabled and not working now so the money would be the only reason why you voted against the treatment. He wants the river and the lake cleaned up
Not all there at times, asked if there was a better time. I did come back. Hillbilly type
Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence, they will move in a few days so the new address is correct.
Read sentence
One of best interviews I have had
Read sentence
Read sentence

Table D.95. Additional comments from interviewers

Read sentence
Both answered and only took husband's answers
Very nice people
Very interesting in the study
The respondent was on lunch break; but did not mind and thought it was good that she had the opportunity to cast her vote.
Very concerned about the water conditions
The respondent seemed to really care about the peoples' voice in this matter and was glad she was chosen
Respondent stated that her late husband used to fish on Tenkiller and Illinois was a great family outing.
She was not feeling well she had the flu.
Took time from your busy schedule.
Football game was on and he divided his attention between me and the game
Life long resident of Oklahoma who earlier in his life had lived near the river and lake when younger
Respondent young and had headache but did pay attention
Very interested in the material.
It was very dark in the apartment, she had one light with probably a 40 watt bulb it was hard to find a place to sit. She was busy doing laundry. I told her I could still do parts of the study while she was doing laundry and I could wait.
Very good interview
This respondent was waiting on an important phone call. He didn't feel that he would have time in the future to do the interview, so he did it now, but stated he would have to end the interview if his call came in. He knew a lot about the river and lake because he grew up around them. He knew how and why they were contaminated. He did not want to give out his name (he's a doctor). He kept telling me to hurry up and get to the questions.
Respondent moving to new address in one week see address info.
Ru was studying this in school and was very interested in knowing more about it
Ru would like for the river to be clean but can't afford it
The respondent was distracted. Before the interview she said her boyfriend had just broken up with her. He was sitting in the same coffee shop where we did the interview.
None, other than the respondent had a lot of comments and observations
Did the interview on the premise that the incentive would be \$50
Comment deleted
I like her a lot
Good
Very nice
I think he was afraid and was sorry he had accepted for me to interview him.
Very nice guy
Comment deleted
Respondent was very familiar with Illinois river and Tenkiller lake
Respondent just wanted the check to go to his mother because she is the boss of the house.
Very informative and polite.
Provide a lot of good information.
She loved the water and wants the water clean
The gentleman was very interested in the study

Table D.95. Additional comments from interviewers

The interview was conducted outside on the porch
There was a three year old that was a little distracting at times but everything went well
She was preparing dinner while we did the interview so she would get up occasionally to check the food in the oven
Respondent had worked in the poultry (turkey) and knew what I was talking about with the phosphorus
Background in the environment
A caregiver on her mother who have just retired with disabilities.
The respondent was quite interested in the subject of alum because he's a fishman and likes to fish.
With assistance from a neighbor, respondent finished interview.
The respondent made pickles for a living and knew what alum is used for while making them.
The respondent's primary language is spanish, but he seemed to be very adept at understanding the subject matter
None; she did the interview at this time on the premise of the incentive being \$50
The respondent was quite attentive in the interview process and asked questions when given information about pollution in the lake and river.
The respondent had two small children in the room and that affected her concentration
This is my first one!
Very interested lady
[Comment deleted]
Comment deleted
Comment deleted
This was the best!!
Comment deleted
Comment deleted
Respondent wants to say that the state income tax is reasonable. The state income tax credits programs are being abused. Such as the rural economic development tax credits.
[Comment deleted]
Very interested in the topic
In the beginning, many distractions, with people in and out. Later in the interview very interested and shared his opinions as one can see.
Very good respondent
R grew up in the area, very interested! R did have her "favorite soap opera" on, the only one she watches, during this time. I did offer to come back, however she agreed to this interview after declining. R states she called westat to opt out of this interview this morning, and left message opting out. When r found out this survey was in an area where she grew up, she was very interested!
Very interested in the study
Ru wants his check mailed to different address . The correct address is in the computer. He wants the river cleaned up not sure if it will take that long
Ru was very interested in getting the lake cleaned up
She had to go pick up her kid she said at first. Then I told her I would come back sometime this week as we have been having a hard time getting in touch with her. She said that we could do it now.
Respondent and her boyfriend were both very attentive. He came and sat down when he started to hear what I had to say.
He was very familiar with the ten killer lake situation, as their family has a cabin their we sat outside and he

Table D.95. Additional comments from interviewers

was very interested in what I had to say.
He was impatient because he is a pastor and really did not have time to do this but had been promising me for a long while that he would do it
She was very knowledgeable about the subject matter and had good suggestions
His wife is blind
Husband was interested but not the respondent who was chosen for interview
She grew up in this area
She kept texting her boyfriend during the first of the interview. She ended up calling him to tell him she would call him back later.
Does not like outdoors or camping
Comment deleted
Comment deleted
Comment deleted
A very knowledgeable gent.
Older woman hard of hearing.
Cell number is a Florida number
This man was living in assisted living center
This was a very hard sell to get in the door and this lady enjoyed this very much.
Very good interview, r knew about this and very interested in this subject
Very good interview, r has a farm and is very informed about water problems
Very good interview, had to do it as fast as possible, he was going out of town
Very good interview, this is the first time respondent has heard anything about this.
I did the interview outside and it was dark used a flashlight
The respondent wasn't feeling well. And it was the man of the house. Not female
Very interesting in the interview
None; if this is done, he suggests continuous monitoring for at least 20 years to start with; should be done on a 20 year cycle
Good interview. Lady did not know what she was getting into, but husband told her she needed to do this.
Respondent says the information was eye-opened.
Respondent says the study was not what he had expected it to be.
[Comment deleted]
Respondent was quite knowledgeable about cleaning up pollution
Respondent freely offered her opinion - suggested that the state charge the farmers and insist on them growing more trees to help keep the running off the phosphorus.
Respondent had a stroke a couple of years ago so I had to repeat some of the questions and wait for her to think about it.
Respondent was very attentive and said she loved the lakes and rivers.
She was very up to date on the issues and completed the survey with no problem.
Made me understand a lot more of what was going on, and she is glad some one is trying to do something about it the other number she can be reached at [number deleted]
R was in a hurry and stated that we must do interview a little faster. Also r is new to Tulsa and does not know how long he will be in his apartment so he requested we send his check to [address deleted]
Informed, intelligent young man.
A very knowledgeable respondent.